

1898
Not to be circulated

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON.

The Remonstrance is published by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, New York, Maine, Illinois, and other States who believe that the great majority of their sex do not want the ballot, and that to force it upon them would not only be an injustice to women, but would lessen their influence for good and imperil the community. The Remonstrants ask a thoughtful consideration of their views in the interest of fair discussion.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Mrs. J. Elliot Cabot.
Mrs. James M. Codman.
Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge.
Miss Sarah H. Crocker.
Mrs. James C. Flak.
Mrs. Charles E. Guild.
Mrs. Charles D. Homans.
Miss E. H. Houghton.
Miss Elizabeth Johnson.
Mrs. Francis C. Lowell.
Mrs. Philip H. Sears.
Mrs. G. H. Shaw.
Miss E. P. Sohler.
Mrs. Henry M. Whitney.
Mrs. Robert W. Lord, Secretary, 56 St. Stephen Street, Boston.
Laurence Minot, Treasurer, 39 Court Street, Boston.

HONORARY MEMBERS.

Mrs. Oliver W. Peabody.
Mrs. James M. Crafts.

The Association was organized in May, 1895. It has eighteen Branch Committees, and members in one hundred and forty-one cities and towns. Its membership includes professional women, wage-earners, and home-keeping wives and mothers.

THE ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION.

AN important step in the extension of organized effort on the part of women who do not believe that the ballot should be given to women was taken at Chicago, May 6, 1897, in the organization of the

Illinois Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women. The association was formed along similar lines and for the same purpose as the earlier associations of the same name in Massachusetts and New York; and the pamphlet which the Illinois Association has sent out explaining its proposed work and setting forth its objections to woman suffrage contains sympathetic letters from the Massachusetts and New York State Associations and from the Brooklyn and Albany auxiliaries.

The Illinois Association is an outgrowth of the useful work which Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin and other Chicago ladies have done for many years in opposing suffrage propositions in the Legislatures of Illinois and other States. Mrs. Corbin is chairman of the Executive Committee of the association; Miss M. D. Hutchinson, 299 Erie Street, Chicago, is secretary; and Mrs. H. N. May, 147 Astor Street, Chicago, is treasurer.

PRACTICAL RESULTS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN COLORADO.

"WOMAN suffrage in Colorado," said Hon. W. F. Hynes, formerly a member of the Legislature of that State, now sojourning at the Raleigh, "is an absolute failure, and it will be a great day for Colorado when the law is repealed.

"There is a growing public sentiment against it, and a great many of our best women are bitterly opposed to its continuance. The stand I take against it is a practical one. The ballot may be theoretically a good thing for the other sex; practically it tends to degrade a majority of the women who avail themselves of its use. There is a coarse female element which soon learns to work only for the success of those candidates who will purchase their votes. Now, is the world benefited by a class such as this, whose only question is, 'What is there in it'?"

"Another class of our women politicians are above such sordid and low inducements, but few would go into the

thick of political conflict for the principle alone. They take up an unpleasant rôle merely at the request of their husbands or other male relatives who will profit by the success of a particular ticket. The woman vote has been growing lighter each year since the passage of the equal ballot law, which is the surest evidence that the very persons for whom the law was passed are careless as regards exercising their privileges." — *From the Post, Washington, D. C., December 3, 1897.*

A BUSINESS WOMAN'S VIEW.

ONE of the most skillful appraisers of New York at this time is a woman. From her profession she makes not only a living but a very handsome income, and enjoys the esteem and confidence of all the men with whom she has dealings. Naturally, she could not have acquired the knowledge she has without long experience. This she got in settling her father's business and estate, and without the slightest notion of ever making the appraisal of real estate her profession.

In the years she has given to her profession she has become interested in it, and she recently said to the Spectator that she did not believe she would be happy should she give it up and devote her time to household duties. "But," she added, "I am not a new woman, nor am I a woman's rights woman. Women have more rights than men have, and if, in addition to them, they had civic duties thrust upon them, they would be quite undone. The place for the normal woman is at home, if she have one; her best occupation is in looking after that home and rearing her children, if she be fortunate enough to have them. If she must earn her own living, that is another matter; but I can't, for the life of me, see how any enlargement of her civic duties would make it easier for her to earn her living. Surely the men without special training or special talents are not having such an easy time just now." — *From the Spectator in The Outlook, August 21, 1897.*

"WOMAN AND THE REPUBLIC."

UNDER the above title, Mrs. Helen Kendrick Johnson, of New York, has written, and Messrs. D. Appleton & Co. have published, a very interesting and valuable survey of the woman suffrage movement in the United States, together with a searching analysis of the claims and arguments of its advocates.

The large majority of American women, who do not ask nor desire the ballot, have reason to be grateful to Mrs. Johnson for the skill and ability with which she has expressed their views. She takes up in turn the various arguments and grievances put forward by the suffragists, and shows upon how slight a foundation they rest.

She denies that woman suffrage is democratic, because democratic government is at an end when those who issue decrees are not identical with those who can enforce them. The familiar fallacy that woman's progress is linked with woman suffrage is exploded in the cogent passages in which Mrs. Johnson shows that the influences which have improved the lot of women during the last fifty years, and have opened wider opportunities for them, have had nothing to do with the woman suffrage agitation. Mrs. Johnson is fully in sympathy, as most women are, with the higher education, and with the claims of women wage-earners to full justice; but these matters are wholly separate from the question of giving women the ballot. Mrs. Johnson argues that the laws are already, in most respects, more favorable to women than to men, and that the special privileges which woman enjoys have been conferred upon her without her possession of the ballot.

One of the most effective chapters is that in which Mrs. Johnson shows the close connection which exists between the suffrage movement and the ideas which make against the permanence of the home and the marriage relation. At this and at other points her argument is strengthened by quotations from the arguments of suffragists.

Mrs. Johnson has studied the literature of the subject, and has familiarized herself with the assumptions and the arguments of the advocates of woman suffrage. She has an abundance of facts and statistics at her command to sustain her points, and her style, while dignified and deliberate, is also trenchant, with an occasional dash of humor.

No single volume has presented so

comprehensively and forcibly the arguments against woman suffrage, from a woman's point of view; and the book is to be specially commended to legislators, who labor under the delusion that the small number of women who clamor for the ballot really speak for their sex.

THE "RESTRAINING INFLUENCE" OF WOMAN.

WHEN it is sometimes pretended that women would raise the tone of debates by preventing freedom, there is an utter confusion of thought. The restraining men from saying what they have to say, in the way in which they would naturally say it amongst themselves, would be not a good, but a real evil, tending to prevent the fatuity of solemn pretences from being exposed, and turning debate from an engine for getting at the realities of the case into a sequence of decorous declamations, not really contradicted on the points in which contradiction and exposure are necessary. In this matter the mere fluency of woman is not so much a qualification as a drawback. That she is capable of making speeches of a certain length, no one doubts, nor speeches of a set, coherent cogency. The vital point is that the mere presence of her sex must necessarily disturb the freedom of style and the possibility of rudeness, where necessary, which are indispensable to the real treatment of public questions. — *Charles Selby Oakley, in the Nineteenth Century.*

GOVERNMENT AND FORCE.

WHAT is the use of concealing the truth about it? The government of the world, like the work of the world, demands a quality other than intelligence; namely, the physical force which, except among the very lowest of the negro races, Heaven has been pleased to deny to women. Suppose England invaded, and occupied only by women, and what could they do except submit? To say that a woman is fit to be a voter by reason of her intelligence is no more sensible than to say that she is fitted by her intelligence to be a sailor or a soldier, or a plate-layer on a railway. The world is governed in the last resort, and made habitable and kept free by the physical force of the men in it, and that condition of things will continue, at all events until war is abolished and the three hundred millions of Chinese become civilized men. Representative government itself, that last discovery of the ages, has but one permanent security, the fact that the voter also wields the

bayonet, and can, if a minority will not obey, coerce it into obedience. How would the female majority, if they happened to quarrel with the men, as they probably would both upon alcohol and war, coerce them into submission! Suppose the country invaded, and the men convinced that peace must be made and the women raging for continued resistance, what would be the condition of the State? — *London Spectator.*

PLAYING AT MUNICIPAL HOUSE-KEEPING.

MANY yards of matter have been printed about "the city of Lincoln, N. J.," and enthusiastic advocates of woman suffrage have pointed to it as a convincing proof of the progress of their cause. Lincoln has been represented as a thriving town within easy reach of New York, in which women not only were permitted to vote, but where they actually controlled the Common Council. By way of bearing out this fiction, three of the women "Councilmen" have left their homes to attend the convention of mayors and city officials in Columbus, Ohio, and it is reported that they intend describing their experiences and making numerous suggestions as to desirable reforms in municipal government.

All this is exceedingly comical to persons familiar with the facts. There is no town or city of the name of Lincoln in New Jersey, and if such a place did exist, women could not, under the State Constitution, take any part in the government. Lincoln is a tract of land owned by a real estate syndicate. The manager of this syndicate is a pushing, ingenious man, who has dabbled in nearly everything with more or less success. How to obtain thousands of dollars' worth of advertising without paying for it was the problem that vexed the manager's soul, until he hit upon the plan of creating a make-believe city. Thus it was that Lincoln came into existence. The promoter circulated invitations far and wide, requesting those interested in such movements to come and see the experiment of a local government in which women were to have an equal voice with the men. The author of this toy government was elected mayor, and three women were chosen for the Council. Their sayings and doings are well advertised—all free of charge; and rarely a week passes without the mayor hatching a scheme or proposition of some kind to attract attention. The Council meets regularly, and discusses abstract questions of sewerage, paving, etc., so as to lead to the suspicion that the members themselves often forget that they are "playing house." It is a harmless amusement, and the real estate syndicate pays the freight. — *Editorial in New York Tribune, October 1, 1897.*

A COLORADO ANTI-SUFFRAGIST.

In an interview printed in the New York Tribune, Mrs. Laban Edward Smith, of Cripple Creek, Col., declared that woman suffrage in her State had so contaminated every social pleasure and function touching feminine life that she must speak her convictions against it. Mrs. Smith continued:—

From the beginning I have set my face against this thing, and a life in the midst of voting women has not tended to reconstruct my views. Once witness election day in a Western town, and you turn forever sickened of female intrusion on masculine territory. There are beflagged carriages galore, giving voters a free ride to the polls, and seated in these vehicles are women from every walk of life. You wonder, as you watch the procession pass by, if there is a lucid conception of their mission in the brain.

In discussing this *fin de siècle* issue, more than two thirds of the women I meet agree with me that they do not want it.

"I vote because the right of suffrage has been thrust on me, and I feel to shirk it would be like shirking any other serious duty," is an expression often heard. Hearing this so repeatedly, you get the idea that even those who do vote do it under protest.

There are ever constant and recurring evidences that woman is a failure in public affairs. In a recent issue of the Rocky Mountain News the State dairy-men cry aloud that they are opposed to any more women dairy commissioners, and make a unanimous appeal to the governor to give them a man. Within the last month the president of the National Educational Association inveighed against woman in difficult public positions.

WOMAN'S VOTE IN NEW ZEALAND.

LAST year's elections in New Zealand offered a striking commentary on the assumption that the vote of women may safely be counted on to support the moral side of public questions. There were two sets of elections on the same day, those touching the election of members of Parliament and those affecting the liquor laws.

As to the first of these, there was no evidence of that nice discrimination regarding the personal character of candidates which has been affirmed of woman's vote. Upon this point Sir Robert Stout wrote in the Australasian Review of Reviews:—

It cannot be said that purity of administration or the character of the can-

didates loomed larger in the eyes of women than in those of men. The prediction that party zeal and partisan feeling would not blind them to the defects of the character of candidates has not been fulfilled. A few members have been returned to the House whose character for sobriety does not stand high, and women were found supporting them just as much as men. It cannot be said that women were any different in their voting from their husbands and brothers. They were carried away just as much by party cries as the men were, and party dominated them.

As to the license question, three issues were submitted. First, the continuing of the number of licensed places as before; second, a reduction in the number of licenses; and third, the entire prohibition of the traffic. An active campaign was made by temperance workers, and it was expected that, with the aid of the women's vote, at least twenty districts would be carried for prohibition. The result was disappointing. The total vote for license exceeded that for no-license by about fifty per cent. Not a single district was carried either for a reduction of licenses or for prohibition. Some of the women's societies openly entered the field for license, and, according to the London Echo, the defeat of the temperance people was largely due to a shifting of the women's vote from the no-license to the license side.

POLITICAL WOMEN.

EXAMPLE is contagious, and the danger would be, not that the great mass of the delightful but impulsive sex would trouble themselves about filling civic or executive or judicial offices in place of the ordering of households, the cultivation of the graces, and the care of babies, but that a considerable leaven, made up of the restless, the unsatisfied, the ambitious among them, might by means of the female electorate clamber up into positions for which the sex, both by nature and proscription, is utterly unfit. For, say the "advanced" sisterhood, if a woman can fill the supreme position in a nation as queen or empress regnant, why should the sex be debarred from occupying other high State posts? They forget that such a plea defeats itself by forthwith suggesting the rejoinder: Show us a country or an era in which the sovereign lady paramount has ever selected women as her responsible cabinet ministers. There lies the *crux* of the whole political woman's question.

Can it be, then, that those who give a qualified encouragement to the female suffragists have really pondered these

bearings of the case? Unquestionably many excellent people of moderate views have been drawn, by the mass of plausible literature disseminated on the subject, into a partial advocacy of woman suffrage, who, could they but descry, even in the far distance, the real terminus of the movement, would shrink from it in dismay. — From "Woman in Politics," in *Blackwood's Magazine*.

DISSATISFIED MISS COUSINS.

A TELEGRAM from St. Louis, dated April 3, announces that Miss Phebe Cousins has "abandoned woman suffrage." She is reported as saying to a reporter:—

Woman in public life will never prove satisfactory. There are limitations that proscribe her success. She is naturally a home-keeper. I would advise all young women to marry and become house-keepers. Twenty years ago I, with other new converts, believed that suffrage for women would prove a panacea for all the evils of politics. I believed that women in public life would prove a regenerating influence. After twenty years of close observation and experience I have come to the conclusion that women are no better than men. After reviewing the characteristics of men and women, I find they are about equally balanced; that there are as many good women as men in the world, and no more. — From *The Woman's Journal*, April 10, 1897.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE DEFEATS ABROAD.

THE Legislature of British Columbia has rejected a woman suffrage bill.

In the Nova Scotia Legislature, February 12, a woman suffrage bill was rejected by a vote of 6 to 23.

The Australian Federation Convention at Adelaide, April 15, and again at Sydney, September 13, rejected a proposition to allow women to vote for members of the House of Representatives.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.

THE voters of the States of Washington and South Dakota are to vote next November upon constitutional amendments conferring suffrage upon women.

This proposition has been twice submitted to the voters of South Dakota and has been twice rejected by them. The last time was in 1890. The suffragists made an active campaign, and were assisted by speakers and money from outside the State: but the amendment was defeated by a vote of almost exactly two to one, 22,972 votes being cast for, and 45,682 against it.

AMERICAN MEN AND WOMEN.

AMERICAN men are neither tyrannical nor condescending toward women. From childhood up they have been in the habit of seeing their sisters walk beside them with independence and privilege equal to their own. Their attitude is one of frank comradery, based upon a respect which on both sides is unconsciously taken for granted. They have, besides, a genial tendency to be proud of their women, and to applaud, rather than discourage, their ambitions. If women wish to vote, these men will not deny them. In fact, many an American household presents the edifying spectacle of a husband more ready to vote the suffrage to his wife than she to accept it.

Notwithstanding this freedom, — perhaps because of it, — one need only obtain an unaffected expression of their feeling to find that, maid and matron alike, the women of the country are, as a rule, content in marriage as a career. They wish for children, and gladly make the prolonged sacrifices necessary to their care and education. The college woman is found, in general, to be no more ready than her uneducated sister to go back upon the womanhood which means self-denial, and the career which means self-sacrifice.

When these American women, full of the complicated interests and duties of the American home and its dependent sociological activities, are confronted with the prospect of exercising the suffrage, their instinct seems to be to draw back. The great majority, when they speak sincerely, will say that home-making, with its allied interests, is their chosen life, and that its demands are so exacting that they must leave the work of government to other hands. — *Ellen Coit Elliott, in the Popular Science Monthly.*

JESTING WITH WOMAN SUFFRAGE

AN undue amount of agitation was occasioned among the friends of woman suffrage in February, 1897, by the announcement that the British House of Commons had passed to a second reading, by a vote of 228 to 157, the bill introduced by Mr. Faithfull Begg, to confer parliamentary suffrage upon women. The reports of the discussion and vote, and the comments of the London papers, make it clear that the House of Commons was only in jest.

RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

IN 1895.

Bills to confer municipal suffrage on women were defeated in the Legislatures of California, Connecticut, Maine, Illinois, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin. Proposed constitutional amendments failed in the Legislatures of Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, and Rhode Island. In Massachusetts, all persons entitled to vote for school committee were permitted to express their opinion upon the expediency of giving women municipal suffrage. When the election took place the men voters voted against the proposition more than two to one, and only about four per cent of the women of the State voted in favor of it. The vote of the men was: Yes, 86,970; No, 186,976; of the women: Yes, 22,204; No, 864.

IN 1896.

In Massachusetts, March 25, the House of Representatives defeated a proposed woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution without calling for the Yeas and Nays. March 31, the House defeated, by a vote of 81 Yeas to 104 Nays, a bill to confer upon women the right to vote upon the License question; and immediately after rejected by an overwhelming vote a bill to confer municipal suffrage upon women.

In Vermont, the Senate passed a bill proposing to confer municipal suffrage upon women taxpayers; but the House defeated the bill: Yeas, 89; Nays, 135.

In Iowa, a suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated in the Senate.

In Rhode Island, a resolution for a suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated in the House.

In California, a constitutional amendment conferring the full rights of suffrage upon women was defeated by the people, at the election November 3.

IN 1897.

In California, both branches of the Legislature rejected a resolution to submit to the people a woman suffrage constitutional amendment.

In Connecticut, the Legislature rejected all woman suffrage measures, including a bill to permit women to vote on the License question, and one allowing taxpaying women to vote upon questions involving the levying of taxes.

In Delaware, the constitutional convention, February 15, by a vote of 7 Yeas to 17 Nays, refused to strike the word "male" from the election clause of the new Constitution. Similar action was taken with a motion to make the clause read "every citizen."

In Indiana, the Supreme Court, February 24, handed down a decision denying the claim that women have the right of suffrage under the existing Constitution. The court held that the Constitution proceeds on the assumption that the suffrage is not an inherent or natural right; and that this is the assumption of the framers of all the Constitutions in the land.

In Kansas, a bill to give women the right to vote for Presidential electors was reported adversely by the Committee on Elections, and the House refused to give it a place on the calendar for discussion.

In Kentucky, a bill permitting women to vote for school officers, and to be eligible to the office of school trustee, was rejected.

In Missouri, a resolution for a constitutional amendment, conferring the suffrage upon women, was defeated.

In Massachusetts, a resolution providing for the submission of a constitutional amendment, striking the word "male" from the Constitution, was defeated in the House: Yeas, 53; Nays, 86. A bill to permit women to vote on the License question was defeated: Yeas, 81; Nays, 98. Propositions to confer municipal suffrage and Presidential suffrage upon women were also defeated.

In Maine, the judiciary committee gave the petitioners for a municipal suffrage bill "leave to withdraw."

In Montana, the Legislature defeated a proposed constitutional amendment to confer the suffrage upon women.

In Nebraska, the House, February 8, defeated a resolution to submit a woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution, 36 to 56, and the Senate refused to consider a municipal suffrage bill.

In Nevada, the Assembly defeated a woman suffrage bill by a vote of 5 to 15.

In New York, a resolution for a suffrage constitutional amendment was introduced in the Legislature, but did not reach a vote.

In Oklahoma, the House, January 25, defeated by a decisive vote a bill to permit women to vote in the Territory; and again, February 18, reaffirmed that action.

This was made still more clear when at a later stage in the session, in order to prevent the bill from coming up again, the House indulged in prolonged debate of a Plumbers' bill and a Verminous Persons' bill. Of these proceedings the London Economist gave the following explanation: —

In the case of female suffrage the business of pledge extraction and pledge giving has become a positive disgrace. Members know in their own minds that female suffrage will never be allowed to become law, and that in the future, as in the past, an organized series of happy accidents will always prevent any bill on the subject getting beyond a second reading. Accordingly, a fashion has grown

up on both sides of the House of giving pledges in favor of female suffrage, which it is known will only be redeemed in the letter, never in the spirit. Men, according to their pledges, vote for the second reading of the women's bill, feeling sure that there is no risk of the measure ever becoming law. It is enough that they have gained the support, or bought off the enmity of the little knot of voters in each constituency who put this question above all others, and loudly declare that they hold the balance at an election. The whole business is treated as a kind of joke, but it is a joke which is not unlikely to have very unpleasant consequences.

The House of Lords did not participate in the jesting, but March 8, by a unanimous vote, refused to take up the bill.